



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,433	07/27/2001	Laurence Lee	P430.12-0002	2032

164 7590 04/28/2003

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

TSOY, ELENA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917 433

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL

Examiner

Elena Tsoy

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory limitation of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 13-19 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 13-19 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claims 13-19, 26-30 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 13-16, 18, 26-30** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glatt et al (US 4,858,552) in view of Reynolds (US 3,354,863) and further in view of Luy et al (US 5,631,102) for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on June 16, 2002 (Paper No. 8).

4. **Claim 17** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glatt et al (US 4,858,552) in view of Reynolds (US 3,354,863), further in view of Luy et al (US 5,631,102) and further in view of Biehl et al (US 4,217,851) for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on June 16, 2002 (Paper No. 8).

5. **Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glatt et al (US 4,858,552) in view of Reynolds (US 3,354,863), further in view of Luy et al (US 5,631,102), and further in view of Cody et al (US 4,993,264).

Glatt et al in view of Reynolds in view of Luy et al fail to teach that an inlet air temperature, a product temperature, a spray liquid temperature, a spray nozzle temperature, an atomizing air temperature, a spray liquid line temperature, a coating zone temperature, a fluidizing gas flow, and atomizing gas pressure are monitored.

Cody et al teach that pressure, temperature and net volume or mass flow are the normal way of monitoring the state of fluidization within a fluidized bed or while a unit is operating (See column 2, lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have monitored an inlet air temperature, a product temperature, a spray liquid temperature, a spray nozzle temperature, an atomizing air temperature, a spray liquid line temperature, a coating zone temperature, a fluidizing gas flow, and atomizing gas pressure in a process of Glatt et al in view of Reynolds in view of Luy et al for coating particles with the expectation of providing the desired normal coating operation since Cody et al teach that pressure, temperature and net volume or mass flow are the normal way of monitoring the state of fluidization within a fluidized bed or while a unit is operating.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments filed November 18, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicants argue that positioning a spray nozzle of Glatt et al above screen would not have been obvious in view of Reynolds.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Reynolds teaches that a process with a spray nozzle positioned *above* a grid 14 (See Fig. 1) produces about 62 wt % plus 8 mesh

size and about 37 wt % plus 4 mesh size and (See column 4, lines 54-62), whereas a process with a spray nozzle positioned *flush* with the grid 14 (See column 5, lines 24-33) produces about 27 wt % plus 8 mesh size and about 33 wt % plus 12 mesh size (See column 5, lines 55-59). In other words, size distribution of coated particles depend position of the spray nozzle all other things being equal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have positioned a spray nozzle in a process of Glatt et al above a perforated base with the expectation of producing coated particles of bigger size depending on intended use of a final product since Reynolds teaches that a process with a spray nozzle positioned *above* a grid produces coated particles of larger size than a process with a spray nozzle positioned *flush* with the grid all other things being equal.

(B) Applicants disagrees with the Examiner's statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Glatt et al and Reynolds using teaching of Luy et al so that liquid line is heated.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Glatt et al teach that the spraying means 6 can be **heated** to *prevent* the spray media from *solidifying* (See Figs. 1, 2; column 6, lines 33-35). Luy et al teach that a liquid line can be **heated** (See column 11, lines 28-29) *obviously* to prevent the spray media from solidifying.

In other words, heating a liquid line of Luy et al and heating spraying means are known equivalent techniques for preventing the spray media from solidifying.

It is held that the substitution of one known equivalent technique for another may be obvious even if the prior art does not expressly suggest the substitution. Ex parte Novak 16

USPQ 2d 2041 (BPAI 1989); In re Mostovych 144 USPQ 38 (CCPA 1964); In re Leshin 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960); Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co. v. Linde Air Products Co. 85 USPQ 328 (USSC 1950).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted one known equivalent technique of Glatt et al for another of Luy et al with the expectation of providing the desired prevention of *solidifying* spray media.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy whose telephone number is (703) 605-1171. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

ET

Elena Tsoy
Examiner
Art Unit 1762

April 23, 2003


SHRIVE P. BECK
SUPERIOR PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1762